

## PARTNERSHIP TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 16, 2007

Page 1

1. Introductions

*Rick Moshier (Chair)* requested introductions.

2. Minutes of March 19, 2007 PTAC Meeting

The minutes for the March 19, 2007 PTAC meeting were accepted.

3. Partnership Reports

Partnership Board – *Rick Moshier, City of Santa Rosa* – The Partnership Board met on April 10, 2007; key items of discussion surrounded the 2009 RTP.

Transit Finance Working Group (TFWG) – *Cory LaVigne, LAVTA* – TFWG met on April 4, 2007. Consensus was reached amongst the group on the Proposition 1B revenue-based distribution options and there was considerable discussion on the Proposition 1B population-based distribution. The group requested that reports from the Transit Planning Managers sub-committee be noted in the minutes regarding discussions surrounding the RTP.

Local Streets & Roads (LS&R) Working Group – *Mike Duncan, City of Fairfield* - LS&R met on April 6, 2007. The Working Group is working on the LS&R Strategic Plan and discussed how to identify bridge needs within the RTP.

Programming and Delivery Working Group (PDWG) – *Matt Todd, ACCMA* – PDWG met on April 16, 2007. Key discussions include 1) STP/CMAQ project delivery and federal funds that require obligation by May 30; 2) ongoing inactive obligations; and, 3) the 2006 State Transportation Improvement Plan (STIP) Augmentation program is holding public hearings the first week of May.

### Discussion Items

4. 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)

a. RTP SAFETEA Gap Analysis

*Ashley Nguyen (MTC)* provided an overview of the RTP SAFETEA Gap Analysis matrix. For key elements of the SAFETEA planning regulations, MTC highlighted how the current plan, Transportation 2030 Plan, addresses the SAFETEA requirement. In cases where there are gaps, MTC demonstrates how the next plan update would close those gaps. Ashley reported that the USDOT guidelines state that MTC will be unable to proceed with any amendments to either the Plan or the TIP unless we are demonstrating we have met the SAFETEA requirements or are in the process of closing the gaps. The deadline to become SAFETEA compliant is July 1, 2007 and MTC feels the gap analysis should be sufficient to make us compliant if it is approved by FHWA. If so, we could continue to make amendments to the TIP after July 1.

b. Transportation 2030 Plan Follow-Up: Transportation 2030 Goals' Measure of Progress Report

*Carolyn Clevenger (MTC) and Raymond Kan (MTC)* reported on the Transportation 2030 Key Measures of Progress Report for the six goals – safety and maintenance, reliability, access, livable communities, clean air, and efficient freight travel. These measures will either be carried over into the next RTP, modified, or deleted depending on their effectiveness in measuring progress, availability of data, and consistency with the goals and objectives developed for the 2009 RTP. MTC staff has prepared this report to document progress made in these key measures between the base year, roughly the time of the adoption of the Transportation 2030 Plan (2004), and now, using the most recent data available (typically 2005 or 2006). Staff reported that given the short time period covered by this data, trend lines for most measures will be difficult if not impossible to determine and; therefore, recommends continuing monitoring key measures, in addition to the outlined proposed changes within the agenda packet, as we proceed with implementation of the next RTP.

Comments and feedback should be submitted to Ashley Nguyen by April 30, 2007. RTP Goals are being taken to the Commission for adoption. The Measures of Progress Report provides information to

## PARTNERSHIP TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 16, 2007

Page 2

demonstrate our commitment to the goals and the different implementation actions associated with those goals.

Committee members advocated mixed-use development over housing development as outlined in the Proposed Key Measures of Progress and in particular voiced concerns over monies for Local Streets and Roads (LS&R) being targeted for the Priority Development Areas (PDA); smaller counties are concerned about being excluded since they are not likely to fit into PDA and density requirements. Committee members expressed concerns that passenger seat miles were used to measure the number of vehicle miles added to transit, stating that the measure doesn't accurately reflect the data, particularly for those operators who design their vehicles for standing room only.

### c. Draft 2009 RTP Goals

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) reported MTC adopted a new set of goals as part of the Transportation 2030 Plan. As part of the preparation of the 2009 Regional Transportation Plan (RTP), MTC staff revisited the current RTP goals and proposed a few revisions; the matrix outlines the specific revisions. The method for determining the proposed changes was three-fold: 1) take a look at existing Transportation 2030 goals and update them to include the SAFETEA planning factors (Safety, Security & Environment); 2) take a look at the findings of the Key Measure of Progress Report and fold them into the draft RTP goals; and 3) establish new goals to be considered as part of the RTP Update. MTC staff is proposing to separate out Safety from Security. Security, under SAFETEA, relates more toward transportation security and emergency management planning vs. Safety is more about traffic safety. MTC staff felt that the Clean Air goal of T2030 does not fully capture current thinking so the addition of a Climate Change goal is proposed in the draft.

Committee members pointed out the many different distances within the proposal and suggested aligning the distances with Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) policy instead of adding another distance. Since transit ridership has been declining steadily since 1982, members suggested using total new transit riders to measure progress as opposed to number of boardings per capita and added that it would be more informative to see the trend over a significant amount of time as opposed to only the most recent last two years.

On the draft goals, MTC staff expects to take the draft RTP goals to advisory committees throughout May; then consolidate the comments and feedback received from the various committees and public outreach and incorporate them into the goals. The final proposal will be taken to the Partnership Board in June and the Commission in July.

### d. Defining the RTP Vision

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) and Lisa Klein (MTC) reported on the process for defining the RTP Vision and highlighted the process of doing scenario performance assessments and the process for the partners to submit projects for inclusion in the 2009 RTP vision. Lisa Klein reported on the strategy for developing policy that would help to define investment strategies, which is to set performance based targets that correlate with RTP goals (aggressive targets) then define 3 scenarios and assess how far the investment scenarios meet the performance targets.

Ashley Nguyen reported on the process for submitting projects. MTC seeks the Partnership's assistance in updating project information for current RTP projects/programs identified in the financially constrained and vision elements of the Transportation 2030 Plan. In addition, MTC is requesting the Partnership to submit, as necessary, new projects/programs for consideration in the RTP Vision. Key Guidelines for new project submission: 1) major capital and operational improvement projects, covered under the freeway performance initiative; 2) derived from or consistent with current plans or corridors studies; 3) define projects fairly well; bundle smaller projects into a larger project plan. Projects generally should not have been previously rejected from a planning or corridor study or have environmental flaws. Note, as part of SAFETEA, projects will be required to provide mid-year construction costs. MTC staff is in the process of developing an online project submittal form, which will provide, in more specific detail, criteria for project submittal. Projects should be submitted by July 27, 2007; performance assessments are scheduled to begin in August.

## PARTNERSHIP TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 16, 2007

Page 3

Group members felt the guidelines for project submittal were too broad and asked for clarification as to what year the project costs should be estimated at, current year or inflated costs. Group members felt it would be too confusing to inflate out costs to a discretionary future year. MTC staff clarified that the Vision is unconstrained and that comparing revenue to the costs will develop an aggregate. For the purposes of costs estimating, project sponsors should use current year (2006) dollars. MTC would inflate those costs for the RTP.

MTC staff reported that the projects/programs for the Vision should be completed by the end of July 2007. Towards the end of the year and into the 1<sup>st</sup> quarter of 2008, the short, mid and long-range project assembly strategies will be developed. Short and mid-range strategies could potentially be projects that meet the criteria for inclusion into the financially constrained element. Long and longer-range strategies could potentially be projects that are eligible for inclusion into the vision element. Group members expressed concern over the process schedule is too aggressive and they would like more time. Members further commented on that specific measures for project assessment should be thought out in more detail and not generalized through labeling.

Ashley Nguyen (MTC) stated that though public outreach has not been finalized, MTC will be soliciting public input on the scenarios and on projects for inclusion in the Vision and will then be doing performance assessments of those project submittals, as done in the past.

Group members raised concerns about how to avoid duplicate project submittals for those projects with multiple sponsors and should projects submittals be coordinated through one agency. Ashley responded that based on feedback from partners, there is interest in having partners be allowed to submit projects; therefore, recommends sponsors work through the CMAs and CMAs would submit projects for inclusion into the RTP, should there be projects the CMAs do not submit then sponsors can submit them on their own. Multi-county projects should go through the lead sponsor. Ashley noted that for previous plans, MTC asked everyone to work through CMAs.

### e. RTP Issue #1 – Land-Use

*Ted Droettboom (ABAG JPC)* described the relationship the between RTP and Focusing our Vision (FOCUS). Ted provided an overview of FOCUS. Ted reported that over the long-term, there will be financial incentives for local governments to designate Priority Development Areas (PDA) and to apply for infrastructure infill incentives. Some of those incentives may come from the present bond programs that are subject to trailer bills in Sacramento. The other incentive lies within the RTP. Issues that need to be resolved are: 1) to what extent should expansion funds within the RTP be directed to regional areas for PDAs and smart growth areas as identified by local governments; and, 2) to what extent to allocate some portion or to at least include a criteria in the allocation for maintenance funds to existing development areas that are planning to take on increased housing. Ted added that in recognition that 80% of the RTP are maintenance expenditures, in excess of over \$80B over 25 years, which is already inadequate for existing maintenance needs, priorities need to be established for those funds. Ted posed the question to the Partnership about prioritizing areas which are experiencing higher rates of growth

In response, Group members suggested looking at areas where employed residents exceed jobs and felt that as a matter of being fair, the Vision should reflect those communities that have experienced higher rates of growth over the last 10-20 years, absorbing more residential units than the rest of the region, in addition to those experiencing current and planned future growth.

The Group members, in general, expressed disapproval over the use of maintenance funds as incentives. Aside from the existing maintenance fund shortfalls, there were concerns with suggestions to reallocating maintenance funds based upon whether or not the city has established a PDA especially since it is unclear as to who will submit a request to be identified as a PDA, where the PDAs will be and the regional model cannot model them.

Group members commented on the ABAG's 2007 Projections' (Projections 2007) land-use assumptions and whether or not the PDAs are reflected in Projections 2007. Ted confirmed that Projections 2007 does

## PARTNERSHIP TECHNICAL ADVISORY COMMITTEE MINUTES

April 16, 2007

Page 4

reflect the PDAs and added that the recently completed Regional Housing Needs Assessment (RHNA), which allocates more housing than Projections 2007 to those areas that have existing high capacity transit and those areas anticipating high employment growth, should also be considered. In addition, in doing project analysis, Ted suggested taking hypothetical PDAs and allocating a higher proportion of regional growth to those regional PDAs than Projections 2007 anticipates to test beyond projects what sorts of land-use changes would be needed to achieve the targets in the RTP.

Ted reported on criteria for requesting to become a PDA stating that there are no minimum density requirements and that the lead applicant must be a local government or someone who controls land-use planning authority. Transit agencies or other agencies are encouraged to apply jointly under a lead applicant. Ted briefed the Partnership on the timeline for PDA selection and incentive funding.

### **Information Items / Other Business**

5. **Transportation Improvement Program (TIP) Update**

*Ross McKeown (MTC)* provided an informational update on the Transportation Improvement Program (TIP).

6. **Legislative Update**

*Rebecca Long (MTC)* summarized the legislation introduced to date that implements Proposition 1B and 1C. MTC is sponsoring AB1637, which is now a 2-year bill and proposes to expand the eligibility of State Transit Assistance (STA) funds to include Lifeline projects. Rebecca reported that MTC is supporting the SLPP-focused SB748, which has been amended from a formula-based program to a competitive program that would allow any voter-approved funding source to be eligible as a match source. The bill is structured with five annual allocation cycles with a \$25M annual cap. Each project is eligible to receive up to \$125M. In trying to resolve any approximate return to source issues, SB748 contains language stating that in awarding the project, the CTC should maximize the number of agencies that receive the funding. Rebecca reported that Proposition 1C, the \$850M housing bond for infill incentives, from the Assembly's perspective, is now on a 2-year track. Rebecca stated that Proposition 1B Transit funding bills include SB716 and AB901. There are concerns about the language within SB716, which reflects a real interest in providing oversight on this money on the part of the legislature. The language speaks about useful life of the projects and the CTC determining project eligibility; Rebecca added that the operators should monitor this bill. The May revise of the State Budget is due May 14. For those interested in further discussions about legislative matters are encouraged to attend the Partnership Legislative Committee meeting on Wednesday, April 18 at 10:00 a.m. in the MTC MetroCenter Fishbowl.

7. **Recommended Future Agenda Items**

*Mike Duncan, City of Fairfield*, reported that the Local Streets & Roads Working Group will be presenting their LS&R Strategic Plan for inclusion into the RTP process.

13. **Next Meeting**

Monday, May 21, 2007

1:30 p.m. – 3:30 p.m.

MTC MetroCenter, Auditorium (Ground Floor)

101 Eighth Street, Oakland, CA 94607